

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the amendments above and the following comments.

Main claim 1 has been amended to recite the impression materials are “dental mold materials.” The language finds support, for example, in the second paragraph on page 3 of the specification, beginning of the fifth line therein. See also the first paragraph on page 6, fifth line therein.

Claim 1 has also been amended to specify that the individual components (“in an unmixed state”) are subject to radiation sterilization in a primary packaging agent. The Examiner is directed to page 10, numbered point 7 towards the bottom of page, teaching the impression material (i.e., the mixed components) and/or its components (i.e., the individual components unmixed) are sterilized in a primary packaging unit.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the amendments introduce new matter. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Applicants have amended the claims in a manner which Applicants believe overcomes the Examiner’s concerns.

With respect to the recitation “and/or their components,” Applicants have amended the claims to make clear that a two-component system is involved throughout.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, Applicants have amended these claims so that they no

longer recite "is used."

Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Larson, US 5,540,876. In response, Applicants remind the Examiner that anticipation requires that each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference, and, further, the absence in the prior art reference of even a single one of the claim elements is sufficient to negate anticipation.

In re Robertson, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Applicants respectfully submit that Larson nowhere teaches "sterilization and/or germ reduction of two-component *dental molding* materials" by "subjecting the two components *in an unmixed state* in a primary packing agent to radiation sterilization," as required by the instant claims. Therefore, Larson cannot anticipate the rejected claims.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olsen, US 4,952,618. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that Olsen also nowhere teaches "sterilization and/or germ reduction of two-component *dental molding* materials" by "subjecting the two components *in an unmixed state* in a primary packing agent to radiation sterilization," as required by the instant claims. Therefore, Olsen also cannot anticipate the rejected claims.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over either Larsen or Olsen. In response, Applicants point out that, as noted above, the two references still do not teach "sterilization and/or germ reduction of two-component *dental molding* materials" by "subjecting the two components *in an unmixed state* in a primary packing agent to radiation

sterilization," as required by the instant claims. Accordingly, the references by themselves cannot make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the instant claims.

Claims 6, 7 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Larson or Olsen in view of Amos, US 5,804,620. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection was dependent upon Larson or Olsen anticipating the basic aspects of the present invention, which, as explained above, is not, in fact, the case. Thus, Amos is relied on to teach the inclusion of polysiloxanes. However, there is still nothing in the combination of Amos with either Larson or Olsen that teaches "sterilization and/or germ reduction of two-component *dental molding* materials" by "subjecting the two components *in an unmixed state* in a primary packing agent to radiation sterilization," as required by the instant claims. Accordingly, the cited combinations of references do not make out a *prima facie* case of the obviousness of the instant claims.

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a bona fide response to all outstanding objections and rejections.

Applicants also believe that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. However, should any issue(s) of a minor nature remain, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at telephone number (212) 808-0700 so that the issue(s) might be promptly resolved.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /Kurt G. Briscoe/

Kurt G. Briscoe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,141
875 Third Avenue - 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
Phone: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844

10

USSN 10/600,773

Amendment under 37 CFR § 1.116 filed August 29, 2008